

### **Remarks**

This amendment is proposed for filing with a request for one month extension under Rule 1.136(a), in response to the official action mailed April 23, 2007.

In the initial prosecution prior to the present continued examination, claims 1-11, 18 and 20-22 were rejected as obvious over a combination of Krishnamurthy (US 5,469,188) in view of Lau (US 6,525,746). Applicant amended the claims upon requesting continued examination and argued that the prior art of record, including Krishnamurthy, did not disclose or suggest the aspect of automatically changing the area of particular scrutiny and reformatting the display to a different changeable selection, in response to the data in the input signal meeting predetermined criteria.

The inventive apparatus thereby can respond automatically to changes in the video input signal, providing a powerful way to analyze the video signal as it changes. For example, the apparatus can be arranged to respond to a color gamut error in the video input signal by automatically shifting from a default formatting selection (for example the full picture) to a formatted display containing areas devoted respectively to a zoomed area including the offending pixel, a vectorscope or amplitude excursion plot, a tabular data display, or another selection that the user chooses to arise automatically when that criterion (a gamut error) occurs.

In the comments in the latest official action, the examiner takes the position that applicant's arguments are not persuasive because the claims are not limited to the features upon which applicant relied in arguments, citing the phrases, "automatically change in format," "different predetermined modes," "successive frames," and "the display changing from a full picture display mode to a shared display [mode]."

The present amendment inserts additional claim limitations that support applicant's argument and applicant's efforts to rely on the fact that the invention is novel and unobvious due at least to the foregoing aspects. There is no disclosure or suggestion in the prior art, including Krishnamurthy and Lau, of automatic changes in formatting in response to the occurrence of predetermined criteria in the video signal.

The Krishnamurthy display is fixed. The Lau display does not have formatted display areas. Neither Krishnamurthy nor Lau processes or attempts to display meaningful data regarding an actively changing video signal. The Krishnamurthy and Lau devices operate on fixed frames, one frame at a time. Therefore, there is no reason to suspect that a person of ordinary skill would have any reason to consider a test apparatus that can idle in a display mode (e.g., full picture display) until user-selected criteria are met in the changing video signal such as a pixel color gamut error, then shift into a user selected different display mode, such as a display of color related variables in the example of gamut error criteria. The prior art does not meet or suggest the invention claimed as a whole.

In previous claim 1, it was recited that *“the video processor is operable to produce a formatted display of selectable data images for presentation on a display device wherein the formatted display comprises a changeable selection . . .”* The video processor was defined as *“operable to change the area of particular scrutiny and said changeable selection of the formatted display, when predetermined criteria are met by said at least one of the successive picture frames and fields of the video picture.”* Applicant accepts the examiner’s apparent position that the video processor could be controlling the display simply to accommodate user manual switch inputs rather than automatically selecting the formatted display because predetermined criteria were found to be met in the changing video signal.

Therefore, applicant has amended the claims to more particularly and distinctly define the subject matter of the invention. Claim 1 as now amended recites that the video processor is operable **automatically** to change the area of particular scrutiny and **automatically to select** said changeable selection of the formatted display, when predetermined criteria are **determined to be** met by said video picture. This aspect is not found in the prior art or suggested by the prior art. The prior art fails to meet the invention claimed as a whole. All the claims depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore allowable over the prior art of record.

No new matter is presented. Among other passages, automatic selection of modes is mentioned as an object of the invention at para. [0017]. Automatically selecting and displaying in a zoom box an area where an illegal pixel or sample value, a color gamut violation or a specific data value occurs, is mentioned at paras. [0020], [0045], [0063] and [0064]. Actively changing the display mode in responses to changes in a video input signal is described at para. [0034]. This clearly refers to changing video and not stop frames that are presented for user analysis wherein the user advances from one pixel to another by manual selection of “next” and “previous” options.

In addition to independent claim 1, claims 2, 12 and 13 have been amended to more particularly and distinctly define the invention and better to distinguish over the prior art of record. Claim 2 recites that the video processor’s selection includes switching automatically to one of the plurality of display modes in response to the video input signal. These display modes are defined as having at least two of the selectable images that can be included in the formatted display (e.g., picture or zoom or report, etc.). Krishnamurthy and Lau do not automatically switch between display modes.

Claim 12 recites that the video processor is operable responsive to the control input (i.e., user input) to define the predetermined criteria upon which the video processor automatically changes the area of particular scrutiny and selects the changeable selection for the formatted display. This aspect is also not found in Krishnamurthy or Lau. In the official action, claim 12 was rejected on the basis that Krishnamurthy has “next” and “previous” buttons that allow the user to advance from a display of the values for one pixel to a next. However such teaching in Krishnamurthy (1) is manual rather than automatic and (2) does not involve any difference in the formatting of the display which is identical for the present pixel and for the next and previous pixels. What changes in Krishnamurthy is the data values of one pixel versus another, both pixels being static references in the current freeze frame. Claims 1, 2 and 12 recite automatic changing in response to the data values meeting predetermined selection criteria. This aspect is not found or suggested in Krishnamurthy or Lau, and

there is no basis of record to believe that the invention as claimed would be obvious from their combination.

Claim 13 has also been amended to define aspects of the embodiments wherein both manual selections and automatic selections are made. In claim 13, manual and automatic selections are coordinated, for example with the automatic selection superseding the manual selection for a period of time, after which the apparatus reverts (automatically) to the manual selection. Krishnamurthy and Lau do not teach or suggest the invention claimed as a whole.

The claims as amended particularly and distinctly define the subject matter of the invention. The differences between the invention and the prior art are such that the subject matter now claimed as a whole is not shown to have been known or obvious. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 21, 2007

/Stephan Gribok/  
Stephan P. Gribok, Reg. No. 29,643  
Duane Morris LLP  
30 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196  
tel. 215-979-1283  
fax. 215-979-1020  
SPGRIBOK@DUANEMORRIS.COM

Docket No. D4781-78